APPEAL NO. 040265 FILED MARCH 26, 2004

This appeal arises pursuant to	the Texas Work	ers' Compens	ation Act,	TEX. LAB.
CODE ANN. § 401.001 et seq. (198	9 Act). A contes	sted case hea	ring was o	opened on
September 10 and continued on N	November 13, 2	2003, with the	e record (closing on
January 5, 2004. The hearing office	r resolved the dis	sputed issues	by decidir	ng that the
compensable injury of	, does not ext	tend to and in	clude a cl	osed head
injury, cognitive deficits, and psychological				
insured) did not waive the right to	contest the ext	ent of the co	mpensable	e injury of
The appellant (claim	imant) appealed	the extent-of-	injury dete	ermination,
essentially on sufficiency of the evide	ence grounds. T	The self-insure	d respond	led, urging
affirmance. The carrier waiver deter	mination was no	ot appealed ai	nd has be	come final
pursuant to Section 410.169.				

DECISION

Affirmed.

The parties stipulated that the claimant sustained a compensable injury on . At issue was whether the compensable injury extended to include a closed head injury, cognitive deficits, and psychological problems. These questions presented questions of fact for the hearing officer to resolve. The hearing officer is the trier of fact and is the sole judge of the relevance and materiality of the evidence and of the weight and credibility to be given to the evidence. Section 410.165(a). Where there are conflicts in the evidence, the hearing officer resolves the conflicts and determines what facts the evidence has established. The Appeals Panel will not disturb the challenged factual findings of a hearing officer unless they are so against the great weight and preponderance of the evidence as to be clearly wrong or manifestly unjust. Cain v. Bain, 709 S.W.2d 175, 176 (Tex. 1986); In re King's Estate, 150 Tex. 662, 244 The hearing officer was not persuaded that the claimant S.W.2d 660 (1951). established a causal connection between the compensable injury of and the claimant's alleged closed head injury, alleged cognitive deficits, and alleged psychological problems. Nothing in our review of the record reveals that the hearing officer's determination in that regard is so against the great weight of the evidence as to be clearly wrong or manifestly unjust. Accordingly, no sound basis exists for us to disturb the disability determination on appeal. Cain, supra. We find no merit in the claimant's contention that the hearing officer must have never taken the time to read various medical reports. The hearing officer specifically noted that all of the evidence was considered in making his findings of fact and conclusions of law.

We affirm the decision and order of the hearing officer.

The true corporate name of the insurance carrier is **(a certified self-insured)** and the name and address of its registered agent for service of process is

CT CORPORATION SYSTEM 350 NORTH ST. PAUL STREET DALLAS, TEXAS 75201.

	Margaret L. Turner Appeals Judge
CONCUR:	
Robert W. Potts	
Appeals Judge	
Edward Vilano	
Appeals Judge	